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Abstract
With the forecasted emergence of autonomous vehicles in urban traffic networks, new control policies are needed to leverage their potential for reducing congestion. While several efforts have studied the fully autonomous traffic control problem, there is a lack of models addressing the more imminent transitional stage wherein legacy and autonomous vehicles share the urban infrastructure. We address this gap by introducing a new policy for stochastic network traffic control involving both classes of vehicles. We conjecture that network links will have dedicated lanes for autonomous vehicles which provide access to traffic intersections and combine traditional green signal phases with autonomous vehicle-restricted signal phases named blue phases. We propose a new pressure-based, decentralized, mixed-traffic network control policy that activates selected movements at intersections based on the solution of mixed-integer linear programs. We prove that the proposed policy is stable, i.e. maximizes network throughput, under conventional travel demand conditions. We conduct numerical experiments to test the proposed policy under varying proportions of autonomous vehicles. Our experiments reveal that considerable trade-offs exist in terms of vehicle-class travel time based on the level of market penetration of autonomous vehicles. Further, we find that the proposed mixed-traffic network control policy improves on traditional green phase traffic signal control for high levels of congestion, thus helping in quantifying the potential benefits of autonomous vehicles in urban networks.

1. Introduction
The emergence of autonomous vehicles (AV) in urban networks leads to new operational challenges that have received a growing attention over the past few years. Of particular interest is the future paradigm wherein legacy (or human-operated) vehicles have been fully replaced with AVs. In this futuristic context, several studies have shown that the management of urban networks may benefit from forecasted technological advancements, such as improved trajectory control, automatic collision avoidance or platooning. However, the intermediate, mixed-traffic state wherein legacy and autonomous vehicles co-exist has not been nearly as much examined by researchers. In such a mixed-traffic context, urban networks will need to adapt to make the most out of AV technology and allow the transition towards fully autonomous traffic, if this is ever to happen. The first AVs evolving in urban traffic networks are likely to have to abide by the existing infrastructure and legislation. However, this picture may change rapidly. We conjecture that with the increase in AV demand, urban traffic networks will adapt and that AV-specific infrastructure will be available to improve network operations at traffic intersections.

In this paper, we hypothesize a mixed-traffic context wherein legacy vehicles (LV) and AVs both have access to dedicated infrastructure in an urban transport network. We propose a new stochastic network control model to manage traffic intersections under mixed-traffic conditions by combining traditional green signal phases with a AV-restricted signal phases called blue phases. During blue phases, only AVs are allowed to proceed through the intersection. On the other hand, green phases can be used by any type of vehicle. To avoid first-in-first-out restrictions on queue departures, we assume that AVs have dedicated lanes to access traffic intersections, hereby referred to as AV-lanes. Legacy vehicle lanes (LV-lanes) can be used by both LVs and AVs to access traffic intersection but for convenience we assume that AVs choose AV-lanes by default. We assume fixed route choice or known turning ratios and we prove that the proposed network control policy is stable under conventional travel demand conditions, i.e. that queues are bounded.
We first discuss the literature on network traffic control in transportation before investigating the state of the art in intersection management with AVs. We then position our paper with respect to the field and highlight our contributions.

1.1. Network Traffic Control

The literature on network traffic control spans across several fields such as optimization and control theory, transportation engineering and computer science. The seminal work of Tassiulas and Ephremides [27] pioneered the research on stability conditions in network traffic control with an application to data packets routing in communication networks. The authors notably introduced the concept of back-pressure algorithm as method for decentralized control of a network of routers. In the context of urban transport networks, there is an extensive body of research on network traffic signal control. Varaiya [29] proposed a network traffic control policy based on max-pressure, a variant of the back-pressure algorithm wherein the control policy chooses the signal phase that maximizes the pressure at each intersection. Stability was proven assuming each turning movement has a distinct queue. Wongpiromsarn et al. [31] proposed a pressure-based policy which maximizes throughput for unbounded queues. However, practical limitations such as link length require a careful choice of the pressure function to avoid queue spillback. Building on this effort, Xiao et al. [32] proposed a pressure-releasing policy that accounts for finite queue capacities. Nonetheless, to more canonically apply the pressure-based routing they assumed that each turning movement has a separate queue, which is often not realistic. Le et al. [11] proposed a fixed-time policy wherein all phases are assigned a non-zero activation time and proved stability for fixed turning proportions and unbounded queues. Recently, Valls et al. [28] propose a convex optimization approach to traffic signal control that decouples the stability of the system from the choice of traffic control policy.

Starting from the seminal work of Smith [25], several efforts have also attempted to model the impact of traffic signal optimization on route choice [34, 10, 33]. In particular, Le et al. [12] used utility functions in max-pressure control to influence routing. However, while Tassiulas and Ephremides [27]'s policy is provably throughput-optimal, max-pressure route choice makes no guarantees on the efficiency of the travel times. We assume fixed route choice in our network traffic control model to focus on green and blue phases signal control, and leave route choice for later studies.

1.2. Intersection Management with Autonomous Vehicles

With the advent of connected and autonomous vehicular technology over the past decades, researchers have progressively explored and proposed new intersection management paradigms instead of the traditional tricolor signal control system. Dresner and Stone [5, 6] proposed the autonomous intersection manager (AIM) protocol as an alternative to traffic signals for AVs. In AIM, vehicles use wireless communication channels to request a reservation from the intersection manager (IM). A reservation specifies the turning movement as well as the time at which the vehicle can enter the intersection. The IM simulates reservation requests on a space-time grid of tiles and accepts requests if they do not conflict with other reservations. If two vehicles will occupy the same tile at the same time, a potential conflict exists and the request must be rejected. The AIM protocol can be used with a First-Come-First-Served (FCFS) policy, wherein vehicles are prioritized based on their arrival time at the intersection. Fajardo et al. [9] and Li et al. [18] compared FCFS with optimized traffic signals, and found that FCFS reduced delays in certain scenarios. However, Levin et al. [16] found that FCFS created more delay with signals in certain common cases (e.g. asymmetric intersections). Traffic signals are within the feasible region of AIM controls [8], so AIM can always perform at least as well as signals when optimized.

Naturally, FCFS is only one of many potential policies for reservations. Schepperle and Böhm [23], Schepperle et al. [24] allowed vehicles to bid for priority: in addition to reservation requests, vehicles would also communicate a willingness to pay and received priority access accordingly. The authors found that auctions reduced delay weighted by vehicle value-of-time, and Vasirani and Ossowski [30] found similar results for a network of intersections. Carlino et al. [2] used system bids to further improve the efficiency of auctions. However, Levin and Boyles [13] found that high value-of-time vehicles could become trapped...
behind low value-of-time vehicles, making it difficult to realize higher travel time savings for high-bidding vehicles.

Several efforts have focused on more microscopic vehicle trajectory optimization formulations to control AVs at traffic intersections. Gregoire et al. [10] developed a cooperative motion-planning algorithm using a path velocity decomposition to optimally coordinate vehicles while preventing collisions. De La Fortelle and Qian [4] integrated a priority-based assignment into autonomous intersection simulation. Altché and De La Fortelle [1] developed a Mixed-Integer Linear Programming (MILP) formulation to coordinate vehicles through intersections. In this model, the IM decides when AVs enter the intersection and at which speed. The authors discretized time and tracked vehicle movement in continuous space variables. Zhang et al. [36, 35] focused on the decentralized control of traffic intersections based on First-In-First-Out (FIFO) conditions and considered fuel consumption, throughput and turning movements. This framework was extended by Malikopoulos et al. [19] proposed a decentralized energy-optimal control framework for connected and automated vehicles. Vehicle separation is ensured by rear-end and lateral collision avoidance constraints and the authors prove the existence of a nonempty solution space.

Levin and Rey [15] proposed a conflict point formulation for optimizing intersection throughput referred to as the AIM* protocol. As in Altché and De La Fortelle [1], the IM decides on AVs’ entry time and speed but instead of discretizing time, the authors discretize the intersection and focus on conflict points to ensure safety. The authors prove that there always exist a conflict-free, feasible solution to the proposed MILP. The present paper builds on this research to coordinate traffic operations during blue phases.

Only a few papers have addressed the case of mixed-traffic, i.e., wherein AVs and legacy vehicles share the intersection. Dresner and Stone [7] proposed to periodically activate a traditional green phase to allow legacy vehicles to access the intersection. Conde Bento et al. [3] suggested that legacy vehicles could reserve additional space to ensure safety while using the AIM protocol. Qian et al. [20] discussed the use of car-following models for collision avoidance among legacy vehicles and AVs. These efforts rely on the deployment of the AIM protocol to handle vehicle reservations but do not discuss their impact at a network level, i.e., the effect of such policies on network throughput and stability. Levin and Boyles [14] found that reserving extra space for legacy vehicles created significant delays and that high AV market penetrations (around 80%) were needed for AIM to improve over traffic signals. The mixed-traffic network traffic control policy combining blue and green phases proposed in this paper may provide an hybrid approach to retain efficiency at lower market penetrations.

1.3. Our Contributions

In this paper, we propose a new decentralized, stochastic model for coordinating mixed vehicular traffic composed of legacy and AVs in a network of intersections. Our model assumes that vehicle route choice, or equivalently, turning proportions are known. We assume that lane queues are measured periodically and we propose a decentralized, pressure-based algorithm to optimize network throughput. We distinguish between traditional green phases and blue phases which are only available for AVs. For this, we assume that intersections are accessible through two types of lanes: LV-lanes, which can be used by both legacy and AVs, and AV-lanes, which are restricted to AVs. During blue phases, all incoming lanes have access to the intersection and traffic is coordinated using the conflict-point formulation proposed by Levin and Rey [15]. At each intersection and each time period, a phase is activated based on the current state of the network using the proposed mixed-traffic pressure-based policy.

We make the following contributions. 1) We propose a new model for network traffic control with legacy and AVs which combines traditional green phases with AV-restricted blue phases. 2) We present a new MILP formulation for green phase activation wherein turning movement capacity is determined endogenously. 3) We extend the max-pressure formulation proposed by Varaiya [29] to lane-based queues and we propose a new mixed-traffic, max-pressure network control policy wherein legacy and AVs share the infrastructure. 4) We prove that the proposed mixed-traffic, max-pressure network control policy is stable, i.e., lane queues are bounded, under reasonable conditions and we characterize the stability region of this policy. 5) We conduct numerical experiments to test the proposed mixed-traffic network control policy.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. We present our stochastic network traffic control model in Section 2. Intersection phase activation models are presented in Section 3. The proposed control
policy and its stability proof are introduced in Section 4. Numerical results are presented in Section 5 and we discuss our findings in Section 6.

2. Stochastic Network Traffic Control

Consider a traffic network $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{A})$ with a set of intersections $\mathcal{N}$ connected by a set of links $\mathcal{A}$. The set of links is partitioned into three subsets: internal links that connect two intersections, denoted $\mathcal{A}_r \subset \mathcal{A}$, source links at which vehicles enter the network, denoted $\mathcal{A}_s \subset \mathcal{A}$, and sink links at which vehicles exit, denoted $\mathcal{A}_e \subset \mathcal{A}$. We are interested in the evolution of queue lengths over the entire network.

We consider two classes of vehicles and lanes: autonomous vehicles (AVs), denoted $a$, and legacy (or human-driven) vehicles (LVs), denoted $l$. We assume that each link of the network consists of a set of lanes which are either restricted to AVs or available to both AVs and LVs. In addition, we model congestion at network intersections using point-queues of infinite size. We use $\mathcal{A}_a$ and $\mathcal{A}_l$ to denote AV-restricted and other lanes, respectively. Note that we assume that movement between different classes of lanes is forbidden.

The distinction between AV-restricted lanes and other lanes will play a central role in the management of traffic at network intersections. In particular, we assume that traffic on AV-restricted lanes can enter the intersection during blue phase exclusively while traffic on other lanes is permitted to enter the intersection during traditional green phases. We propose a new control policy that maximizes network throughput while accounting for queues at mixed-traffic intersections capable of handling both blue and green phases. Traffic control phases are formally introduced in Section 3.

Let $x_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}_+$ be the number of vehicles on link $i \in \mathcal{A}$ seeking to enter the intersection at time $t$. Although we discretize vehicles in our numerical experiments, integer queue lengths are not necessary for the analytical results presented hereafter. Let $x(t)$ be the array of all queue lengths at time $t$. $x(t)$ is the state of the network, and the state space is $\mathcal{X} = \{x_i(t) \geq 0 : i \in \mathcal{A}\}$. We consider discretized time and we assume fixed phase time of length $\Delta t$. Further, we assume that the state of the network $x(t)$ is known at each time step $t = 0, \Delta t, 2\Delta t, \ldots$. The goal is to design a throughput-optimal network traffic control policy that optimally selects a traffic signal control at each time period $[t, t + \Delta t]$.

The proposed stochastic network traffic control formulation is based on the concept of vehicle movements which are formally defined below.

Definition 1. A movement $(i, j) \in \mathcal{A}^2$ is a vehicle trajectory from lane $i$ to lane $j$ across a common intersection $n \in \mathcal{N}$ in the network. We denote $\mathcal{M}$ the set of all movements in the network.

AVs communicate their position with IMs to make use of the AIM protocol, hence we assume that movement-specific queues are known for AVs. In contrast, LV-queues can be detected through loop detectors and flow sensors currently in use for traffic signals but their destination is assumed unknown. Specifically, let $\mathcal{A}_a \subset \mathcal{A}$ be the set of AV-restricted lanes. For these lanes, we assume known movements queues, i.e. if $j \in \mathcal{A}_a$, then $x_i(t) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{A}_a} x_{ij}(t)$ and $x_{ij}(t)$ is known. In contrast, for other lanes $i \in \mathcal{A}_l = \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}_a$, only $x_i(t)$ is known since route choice for LVs is assumed unknown.

Let $p_{ij}(t)$ be a random variable denoting the turning proportion from lane $i$ to $j$ at time $t$ with known mean $p_{ij}$. Let $D_i(t)$ be a random variable denoting the external incoming traffic onto lane $i$ at time $t$ with known mean $d_i$. For each movement $(i, j) \in \mathcal{A}^2$, we assume that maximum, unconditional movement service rates $\bar{s}_{ij}$ are known. We denote $\mathbf{p}$, $\mathbf{d}$ and $\mathbf{s}$ the vectors of mean turning proportions, mean demands and unconditional movement service rates, respectively. These upper bounds on movement service rates represent the maximum number of vehicles that can be moved from lane $i$ to lane $j$ during time period $t$ when no conflicting movement with $(i, j)$ is activated. From these rates, we can determine maximum, unconditional lane service rates $\bar{s}_i = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{A}} \bar{s}_{ij}$. For convenience if $i$ and $j$ do not correspond to a possible movement in the network, e.g. they belong to different intersections or they are both entry or exit lanes of the same intersection, we assume that $p_{ij} = 0$. Hence, we can define the sets of AV-movements $\mathcal{M}_a \equiv \{(i, j) \in \mathcal{A}_a^2 : p_{ij} \neq 0\}$ and LV-movements $\mathcal{M}_l \equiv \{(i, j) \in \mathcal{A}_l^2 : p_{ij} \neq 0\}$.
Traffic at network intersections is coordinated by phases which are determined by the selection of the activation matrix.

**Definition 2.** An activation matrix $\alpha(t)$ is a $|A| \times |A|$-matrix wherein all entries take a value between 0 (inactive) and 1 (fully active), i.e. $\alpha_{ij}(t) \in [0,1]$.

The entries of an activation matrix characterize the activeness of the corresponding phase: $\alpha_{ij}(t) = 1$ means that the service rate of movement $(i,j)$ is maximal, whereas $\alpha_{ij}(t) = 0$ means that movement $(i,j)$ cannot serve any vehicles during time period $t$. Fractional activation values model situations where conflicting movements, i.e. posing a safety risk, simultaneously have non-zero activation values. In the proposed traffic control policy, the selection of the activation matrix requires the solution of two mathematical optimization problems presented in Section 3.1 and 3.2, respectively and further details are discussed therein.

Let $S_i(\alpha(t))$ be a random variable denoting the number of cars serviced in lane $i$ if activation matrix $\alpha(t)$ is used. The term $S_i(\alpha(t))$ is endogenous to the activation matrix $\alpha(t)$ selected by the proposed control policy. The proposed stochastic network traffic control model is summarized by the lane-queue evolution equation (1).

$$x_j(t + \Delta t) = x_j(t) - S_j(\alpha(t)) + \sum_{i \in A} P_{ij}(t) S_i(\alpha(t)) + D_j(t) \quad \forall j \in A$$

Note, if $j \notin A$, then $D_j(t) = 0$. Conversely, if $j \in A$, then $j$ has no predecessor links, thus $\sum_{i \in A} P_{ij}(t) = 0$. Although AV-lanes and other lanes have identical queue evolution equations, the information available is more accurate for AV-lanes, this used in the calculation of network control policies.

In related works, the term $S_i(\alpha(t))$ is commonly calculated as the minimum between the supply (lane or movement service capacity) and the demand (lane or movement queue length) [29, 11]. However, this modeling approach does not capture the interdependency between the activation of possibly conflicting movements with lane or movement service capacity and queue length. Precisely, previous efforts have assumed that a set of activation matrices is provided for each intersection and that lane or movement service capacities can be pre-processed accordingly. This overlooks the impact of queue length on intersection capacity. In contrast our proposed integrated approach aims to accurately estimate the expected number of serviced vehicles at each time period by leveraging the available lane-queue length information (note that this information is also assumed available in the aforementioned papers).

3. Traffic Control with Green and Blue Phases

In this section, we present two intersection-based formulations to coordinate traffic at intersections during green (Section 3.1) and blue (Section 3.2) phases, respectively. We then show that throughput-optimal network-wide traffic coordination can be decentralized by implementing a max-pressure-based policy that activates the highest pressure phase—among green and blue phases—at each intersection.

3.1. Green Phase

For green phases, we propose a MILP approach that aims to identify the optimal activation matrix $\alpha(t)$ while accounting for movement capacity loss due to potential conflicting movements and known lane-queues. Specifically, we estimate the expected number of serviced vehicles (or lane service rates) for each lane in the network when this value is assumed endogenous to the selected activation matrix.

Let $A_n^l \subset A_l$ (respectively, $M_n^l \subset M_l$) be the set of LV-lanes (respectively, LV-movements) of intersection $n \in N$. We make the following design assumptions:

1. The set of LV-movements $M_n^l$ can be partitioned into two sets: priority $P_n^l$ and yield $Y_n^l$ movements, i.e. $M_n^l = P_n^l \cup Y_n^l$ and $P_n^l \cap Y_n^l = \emptyset$.
2. Two conflicting priority movements cannot be selected simultaneously.
3. Two conflicting yield movements cannot be selected simultaneously.
4. If selected, a priority movement \((i, j) \in \mathcal{P}^n\) has a known full movement capacity \(s_{ij}\).
5. If selected, a yield movement can have partial movement capacity.

Assumptions 2 and 3 are motivated by the fact that in existing traffic intersections there needs to be a consensus between movements posing a safety risk: this consensus is traditionally resolved by “right-of-way” rules which implies that one movement must have priority over the other. For instance, two through movements cannot be activated simultaneously unless they are parallel. In our numerical experiments we model through and right turns as priority movements whereas left turns are categorized as yield movements.

Let \(\beta_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}\) be a binary variable representing the selection of LV-movement \((i, j) \in \mathcal{M}_i^n\) in the activation matrix \((\beta_{ij} = 1)\) or not \((\beta_{ij} = 0)\). Let \(g^t_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}\) be a binary parameter equal to 1 if \((i, j), (i', j') \in \mathcal{P}\), or if \((i, j), (i', j') \in \mathcal{Y}^n\). We can impose the following constraint to forbid the simultaneous selection of two priority or yield movements:

\[
\beta_{ij} + \beta_{i'j'} \leq 1 \quad \forall (i, j), (i', j') \in \mathcal{M}_i^n : g^t_{ij} = 1
\]  

(2)

Let \(\alpha_{ij}(t) \in [0, 1]\) be the decision variable representing the fraction of capacity allocation to LV-movement \((i, j) \in \mathcal{M}_i^n\). We have the relationship \(\alpha_{ij}(t) \leq \beta_{ij}\).

We can use a supply-demand formulation to calculate the expected number of vehicles \(y_{ij}(t) \geq 0\) serviced on movement \((i, j) \in \mathcal{M}_i^n\). On the supply side, the expected movement capacity is \(\alpha_{ij}(t)s_{ij}\). Assuming known, exogenous turning ratios, \(p_{ij}\), the demand for movement \((i, j)\) at time \(t\) is upper-bounded by \(p_{ij}x_i(t)\). However, FIFO behavior on lanes may lead to vehicle-blocking [26, 17]. To capture this FIFO behavior, let \(\phi_i(t) \in [0, 1]\) be a variable representing the effect of FIFO behavior on vehicles movements from lane \(i \in \mathcal{A}_i^n\). The expected service rate for movement \((i, j) \in \mathcal{M}_i^n\) can be calculated as:

\[
y_{ij}(t) = \min\{\alpha_{ij}(t)s_{ij}, p_{ij}x_i(t)\phi_i(t)\}
\]  

(3)

The value of lane-based variables \(\phi_i(t)\) can be adjusted based on the ratio of supply to demand for each movement. Specifically we impose the constraints:

\[
\phi_i(t) \leq \frac{\alpha_{ij}(t)s_{ij}}{p_{ij}x_i(t)} \quad \forall (i, j) \in \mathcal{M}_i^n
\]  

(4)

Let \(y_i(t) \geq 0\) be the lane service rate for \(i \in \mathcal{A}_i^n\). This rate can be defined as the sum of expected service rates over all movements from lane \(i\), i.e. \(y_i(t) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{A}_i^n : (i, j) \in \mathcal{M}_i^n} y_{ij}(t)\). Variables \(y_i(t)\) represent the expected value of the decrease in queue length, i.e. \(S_i(\alpha(t))\) in the queue evolution equation (1) if the green phase with activation matrix \(\alpha(t)\) is selected by the control policy.

For a priority movement \((i, j) \in \mathcal{P}^n\), variable \(\alpha_{ij}(t)\) behaves as a binary variable, i.e. \(\alpha_{ij}(t) = 1\) implies that \((i, j)\) is selected in the activation matrix whereas \(\alpha_{ij}(t) = 0\) implies that it is not. Although fractional values are permitted there is no incentive to allocate a fraction of capacity to a priority movement. In turn, for a yield movement \((i, j) \in \mathcal{Y}^n\), the available capacity depends on the selection of conflicting movements. Note that, based on our assumptions, a yield movement may conflict with any number of priority movements as long as these priority movements do not conflict with each other. To calculate the endogenous expected capacity of yield movements, we define \(\mu_{ij} \geq 0\) as the slack of movement \((i, j) \in \mathcal{M}_i^n\) representing the expected available capacity for this movement if activation matrix \(\alpha(t)\) is selected. The slack of movement \((i, j) \in \mathcal{M}_i^n\) is the positive part of the gap between supply and demand:

\[
\mu_{ij} \equiv \max\{\alpha_{ij}(t)s_{ij} - p_{ij}x_i(t)\phi_i(t), 0\} = (\alpha_{ij}(t)s_{ij} - p_{ij}x_i(t)\phi_i(t))^+
\]  

(5)

Let \(C_{ij}\) be the set of potentially conflicting movements with movement \((i, j) \in \mathcal{Y}^n\). This set can be defined by examining the topology the intersection containing movement \((i, j)\) and identifying conflict points among vehicle trajectories. Formally, we can use a binary parameter \(c_{ij}^{t'}\) equal to 1 if yield movement
\((i,j)\) and priority movement \((i'j')\) present a collision risk and 0 otherwise. This parameter is assumed to be pre-processed for all intersections in the network. Then we can define the potential conflict set as:

\[
C_{ij} = \{(i',j') \in \mathcal{P}^n : c_{ij}^{i'j'} = 1\}, \quad \forall (i,j) \in \mathcal{Y}^n
\]  

(6)

Accordingly, we can define the endogenous expected capacity of yield movement \((i,j) \in \mathcal{Y}^n\) as:

\[
\alpha_{ij}(t) s_{ij} = \min \left\{ \sum_{(i',j') \in C_{ij}} \mu_{i'j'}, s_{ij} \right\}
\]

(7)

Note that since \(\alpha_{ij}(t) \in [0,1]\), the term \(\alpha_{ij}(t) s_{ij}\) is naturally upper-bounded by \(s_{ij}\). Since the optimization aims to maximize throughput, the min function in Constraint (7) can be linearized using the inequality:

\[
\alpha_{ij}(t) s_{ij} \leq \sum_{(i',j') \in C_{ij}} \mu_{i'j'} s_{ij}.
\]

Finally, the upper bound on \(\alpha_{ij}(t)\) can be omitted since it is upper bounded by \(\beta_{ij}\).

Observe that binary variables are required to linearize the max function in the slack variables \(\mu_{ij}\). Let \(\lambda_{ij} \in \{0,1\}\) be equal to 1 if \(\alpha_{ij}(t) s_{ij} - p_{ij} x_i(t) \phi_i(t) \geq 0\) and 0 otherwise. Let \(M_{ij} \geq 0\) be a large number such that \(M_{ij} \geq \max\{ -\alpha_{ij}(t) s_{ij} + p_{ij} x_i(t) \phi_i(t) \}\), the definitional constraint (5) can be expressed using the set of integer-linear constraints:

\[
(\lambda_{ij} - 1) M_{ij} \leq \alpha_{ij}(t) s_{ij} - p_{ij} x_i(t) \phi_i(t)
\]

(8a)

\[
\lambda_{ij} M_{ij} \geq \alpha_{ij}(t) s_{ij} - p_{ij} x_i(t) \phi_i(t)
\]

(8b)

\[
\mu_{ij} \leq \alpha_{ij}(t) s_{ij} - p_{ij} x_i(t) \phi_i(t) + (1 - \lambda_{ij}) M_{ij}
\]

(8c)

\[
\mu_{ij} \geq \alpha_{ij}(t) s_{ij} - p_{ij} x_i(t) \phi_i(t)
\]

(8d)

\[
\mu_{ij} \leq \lambda_{ij} M_{ij}
\]

(8e)

\[
\mu_{ij} \geq 0
\]

(8f)

\[
\lambda_{ij} \in \{0,1\}
\]

(8g)

Our objective is to select a control policy that maximizes network throughput. We build on the max-pressure literature and define \(w_i(t)\) as the weight of lane \(i \in \mathcal{A}\) at time \(t\) onto the network based on current queue lengths [27]:

\[
w_i(t) = x_i(t) - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{A} : (i,j) \in \mathcal{M}} p_{ij} x_j(t)
\]

(9)

As in Varaiya [29], we will later show that maximizing pressure locally, \(i.e.\) at each intersection, will maximize network throughput. Hence, the objective function for the green phase activation program should maximize local pressure, \(i.e.\) \(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}} w_i(t) y_i(t) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}} w_i(t) \sum_{j \in \mathcal{A} : (i,j) \in \mathcal{M}_i} y_{ij}(t)\). Let \(Z^u_G(x(t))\) be the maximal local pressure that can be obtained using the green phase based on the network state \(x(t)\) at intersection \(n \in \mathcal{N}\). The proposed mathematical programming formulation for identifying throughput-optimal green phases is summarized below in (10) and hereby referred to as the GREEN.

\[
Z^u_G(x(t)) = \max \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}} w_i(t) \sum_{j \in \mathcal{A} : (i,j) \in \mathcal{M}_i} y_{ij}(t)
\]

(10a)

s.t. \(y_{ij}(t) \leq \alpha_{ij}(t) s_{ij}\) \(\forall (i,j) \in \mathcal{M}_i^n\)

(10b)

\(y_{ij}(t) \leq p_{ij} x_i(t) \phi_i(t)\) \(\forall (i,j) \in \mathcal{M}_i^n\)

(10c)

\(\phi_i(t) \leq \alpha_{ij}(t) s_{ij} / p_{ij} x_i(t)\) \(\forall (i,j) \in \mathcal{M}_i^n : p_{ij} x_i(t) > 0\)

(10d)

\[\alpha_{ij}(t) s_{ij} \leq \sum_{(i'j') \in \mathcal{C}_{ij}} \mu_{i'j'}\]

(10e)
\[
\beta_{ij} + \beta_{ij'} \leq 1 \quad \forall (i, j), (i', j') \in \mathcal{M}_{ij}^n : g_{ij}^{ij'} = 1 
\]
\[
\alpha_{ij}(t) \leq \beta_{ij} \quad \forall (i, j) \in \mathcal{M}_i^n 
\]
\[
(\lambda_{ij} - 1)M_{ij} \leq \alpha_{ij}(t)\bar{s}_{ij} - p_{ij}\bar{x}_i(t)\phi_i(t) \quad \forall (i, j) \in \mathcal{M}_i^n 
\]
\[
\lambda_{ij}M_{ij} \geq \alpha_{ij}(t)\bar{s}_{ij} - p_{ij}\bar{x}_i(t)\phi_i(t) \quad \forall (i, j) \in \mathcal{M}_i^n 
\]
\[
\mu_{ij} \leq \alpha_{ij}(t)\bar{s}_{ij} - p_{ij}\bar{x}_i(t)\phi_i(t) + (1 - \lambda_{ij})M_{ij} \quad \forall (i, j) \in \mathcal{M}_i^n 
\]
\[
\mu_{ij} \geq \alpha_{ij}(t)\bar{s}_{ij} - p_{ij}\bar{x}_i(t)\phi_i(t) \quad \forall (i, j) \in \mathcal{M}_i^n 
\]
\[
\mu_{ij} \leq \lambda_{ij}M_{ij} \quad \forall (i, j) \in \mathcal{M}_i^n 
\]
\[
\mu_{ij} \geq 0 \quad \forall (i, j) \in \mathcal{M}_i^n 
\]
\[
\lambda_{ij} \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall (i, j) \in \mathcal{M}_i^n 
\]
\[
\beta_{ij} \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall (i, j) \in \mathcal{M}_i^n 
\]
\[
\alpha_{ij}(t) \geq 0 \quad \forall (i, j) \in \mathcal{M}_i^n 
\]
\[
y_{ij}(t) \geq 0 \quad \forall (i, j) \in \mathcal{M}_i^n 
\]
\[
1 \geq \phi_i(t) \geq 0 \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{A}_i^n 
\]

The solution of \textsc{Green} gives an optimal activation matrix at intersection \(n\) for the green phase, denoted \(\alpha^n_G(t)\), i.e. \(\alpha^n_G(t) \in \arg \max \{Z^n_G(x(t))\}\).

### 3.2. Blue Phase

To coordinate traffic during blue phases, we adapt a mixed integer programming formulation from Levin and Rey [15] to maximize throughput. For blue phases, lane service rates can be obtained by solving an optimization problem wherein collision avoidance constraints are imposed at all conflicts point of the intersection. In contrast to \textsc{Green}, the blue phase model optimizes individual vehicle trajectories while ensuring traffic safety. Specifically, the blue phase Model finds optimal AVs speeds and departure time based on the current AV demand at each intersection.

Let \(\mathcal{V}^n(t)\) be set of AVs in the network at time \(t\) seeking to enter intersection \(n \in \mathcal{N}\). Let \(\mathcal{A}_i^n \subset \mathcal{A}_n\) (respectively, \(\mathcal{M}_a^n \subset \mathcal{M}_a\)) be the set of AV-lanes (respectively, AV-movements) of intersection \(n \in \mathcal{N}\). For each intersection, the set of possible AV-movements is assumed known and intersecting AV-movements generate conflict-points. Thus, an AV-movement \((i, j) \in \mathcal{M}_a^n\) can be viewed as a two-dimensional trajectory which consists of a sequence of conflict-points starting at the head node of lane \(i\) denoted \(i^+\) and ending at the tail node of lane \(j\) denoted \(j^-\). Since AVs’ route choice is assumed to be known, we can map each vehicle to a trajectory. Let \(\gamma_v^-\) (respectively, \(\gamma_v^+\)) be the entry (respectively, exit) point of vehicle \(v \in \mathcal{V}^n(t)\) into the intersection. Let \(\rho_v\) be the trajectory of \(v\), i.e. \(\rho_v = \{\gamma_v^-, \ldots, \gamma_v^+\}\).

Recall that we that the current time period consists of the interval \([t, t + \Delta t]\). Let \(t_v(c) \geq t\) be a decision variable representing the arrival time of vehicle \(v\) at point \(c \in \rho_v\) and let \(\tau_v(c) \geq 0\) be a decision variable representing the time point \(c \in \rho_v\) is reserved for vehicle \(v\). The values of these variables is determined by the speed assigned and the departure assigned to \(v\) as described in Levin and Rey [15].

Let \(z_v\) be a binary variable denoting if vehicle \(v \in \mathcal{V}^n(t)\) traverses intersection \(n\) during the current time period (1) or not (0). Formally,

\[
z_v = 1 \iff t_v(\gamma_v^+) + \tau_v(\gamma_v^+) \leq t + \Delta t
\]

\[
A \text{ relaxed form of this relationship can be modeled using integer-linear constraints as follows:}
\]
\[
t_v(\gamma_v^+) + \tau_v(\gamma_v^+) \leq t + \Delta t + (1 - z_v)M_v
\]
where $M_v \geq 0$ represents a large number which can be set to the maximal exit time of vehicle $v \in \mathcal{V}^n(t)$. Constraint (12) imposes that $z_v = 1$ if $t_v(\gamma^+_v) + \tau_v(\gamma^-_v) \leq t + \Delta t$ and is free otherwise.

Let $\mathcal{V}^n_i(t) = \{v \in \mathcal{V}^n(t) : \gamma^-_v = i^+\}$ be the set of vehicles seeking to travel from lane $i \in \mathcal{A}^n_i$ at time $t$. The number of AVs serviced on lane $i \in \mathcal{A}^n_i$ is $\sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}^n_i(t)} z_v$. Similarly to the objective function of GREEN, the objective of the blue phase model is to maximize local pressure on AV-lanes. This can be formulated as: $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}^n} w_i(t) \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}^n_i(t)} z_v$.

The remaining of the blue phase model is identical to that presented in Levin and Rey [15]. Binary variables $\delta_{vv'}(c)$ are used to model the order of vehicles at conflict points, i.e. $\delta_{vv'}(c) = 1$ (respectively $\delta_{vv'}(c) = 0$) means that vehicle $v$ (respectively, $v'$) traverses conflict point $c$ before vehicle $v'$ (respectively, $v$) and disjunctive trajectory separation constraints (see (13h) and (13i) in the formulation below) are used to ensure that conflict points are reserved a sufficient amount of time to ensure traffic safety. This formulation builds on space-discretized collision avoidance formulations for air traffic control [21, 22]. For more details on this conflict-point formulation, we refer the reader to Levin and Rey [15].

Let $Z_B^\rho(x(t))$ be the maximal local pressure that can be obtained using the blue phase based on the network state $x(t)$ at intersection $n$. The MILP used to coordinate traffic during blue phases is summarized below in Formulation (13) and hereby referred to as the BLUE.

$$Z_B^\rho(x(t)) = \max \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}^n_i} w_i(t) \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}^n_i(t)} z_v \quad (13a)$$

s.t. $t_v(\gamma^+_v) + \tau_v(\gamma^-_v) \leq t + \Delta t + (1 - z_v) M_v$ \quad $\forall v \in \mathcal{V}^n(t)$ \quad (13b)

$t_v(\gamma^-_v) \geq e_v$ \quad $\forall v \in \mathcal{V}^n(t)$ \quad (13c)

$\tau_v(c) = \frac{L_v}{w} + \frac{L_v(t_v(\gamma^+_v) - t_v(\gamma^-_v))}{d_v(\gamma^-_v, \gamma^+_v)}$ \quad $\forall v \in \mathcal{V}^n(t), \forall c \in \rho_v$ \quad (13d)

$\frac{d_v(\gamma^-_v, \gamma^+_v)}{U_v} \leq \frac{t_v(\gamma^+_v) - t_v(\gamma^-_v)}{d_v(\gamma^-_v, \gamma^+_v)}$ \quad $\forall v \in \mathcal{V}^n(t)$ \quad (13e)

$\frac{t_v(c) - t_v(\gamma^-_v)}{d_v(\gamma^-_v, c)} = \frac{\gamma_v^+}{d_v(\gamma^-_v, \gamma^+_v)}$ \quad $\forall v \in \mathcal{V}^n(t), \forall c \in \rho_v$ \quad (13f)

$\frac{t_v(c) - t_v(\gamma^-_v)}{d_v(\gamma^-_v, c)} \leq \tau_v(c)$ \quad $\forall v, v' \in \mathcal{V}^n(t) : \gamma^-_v = \gamma^-_{v'}, e_v < e_{v'}$, $\forall c \in \rho_v \cap \rho_{v'}$ \quad (13g)

$\frac{t_v(c) - t_v(\gamma^-_v)}{d_v(\gamma^-_v, c)} \leq (1 - \delta_{vv'}(c)) M_{vv'}$ \quad $\forall v, v' \in \mathcal{V}^n(t) : \gamma^-_v \neq \gamma^-_{v'}, \forall c \in \rho_v \cap \rho_{v'}$ \quad (13h)

$\delta_{vv'}(c) + \delta_{vv'}(c) = 1$ \quad $\forall v, v' \in \mathcal{V}^n(t) : \gamma^-_v \neq \gamma^-_{v'}, v < v'$, $\forall c \in \rho_v \cap \rho_{v'}$ \quad (13i)

$\delta_{vv'}(c) \in \{0, 1\}$ \quad $\forall v, v' \in \mathcal{V}^n(t) : \gamma^-_v \neq \gamma^-_{v'}, \forall c \in \rho_v \cap \rho_{v'}$ \quad (13j)

$z_v \in \{0, 1\}$ \quad $\forall v \in \mathcal{V}^n(t)$ \quad (13k)

$\tau_v(c) \geq 0$ \quad $\forall v \in \mathcal{V}^n(t), \forall c \in \rho_v$ \quad (13l)

Activating the blue phase at intersection $n$ can be represented by setting $\alpha_{ij}(t) = 1$ to all movements $(i, j) \in \mathcal{M}^n_{ii}$, which we denote $\alpha_B^n(t)$, i.e. $\alpha_B^n(t) \in \arg \max \{Z_B^\rho(x(t))\}$. If the blue phase is activated, AV-traffic can then coordinated based on the optimal value of the decision variables of BLUE which provides AVs with an entry time and an optimized speed to traverse the intersection.
The proposed traffic control formulation is illustrated in Figure 1 for a typical traffic intersection connected to eight incoming and eight outgoing links, each of which composed of one LV-lane and one AV-lane. A possible solution to Green is shown in Figure 1b with four priority LV-movements and two yield LV-movements. The blue phase is illustrated in 1c wherein AV-traffic is coordinated by solving Blue and reserving conflicts points for each vehicle in order to maximize local pressure.

![Figure 1](image)

Figure 1: Figure 1a shows all possible LV- and AV-movements on a typical intersection. Figure 1b depicts a possible green phase involving priority and yield LV-movements and Figure 1c illustrates the conflict-point formulation during blue phase.

The MILPs Green and Blue can be solved to optimality using traditional branch-and-cut-and-bound techniques in near real-time, as shown in Section 5. Their solution provides the basis for the proposed online network traffic control policy which is introduced in the next section, along with its proof of stability.

4. Mixed-traffic Network Control Policy and Stability

In this section, we present a new network traffic control policy for mixed-traffic intersection control combining green (LV-lane restricted) and blue phases (AV-lane restricted) and prove that it maximizes throughput. The proposed network traffic control policy works by repeatedly solving Green and Blue at each time period $t$ based on the network state $\mathbf{x}(t)$ and combining local (intersection-level), optimal activation matrices into a network-wide activation matrix $\mathbf{\alpha}(t)$.

4.1. Stability Region

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be the set of activation matrices. A policy is a function $\pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ that chooses an $\mathbf{\alpha}(t) \in \mathcal{M}$ for every state $\mathbf{x}(t)$. Stability is defined as follows:

**Definition 3.** A stochastic queue evolution process is stable under policy $\pi$ if and only if there exists $K < \infty$ such that the network state $\mathbf{x}(t)$ verifies:

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}(t)] < K$$

(14)

Let $\hat{t}$ be a time period index. The stability condition (14) is also equivalent to the following statement: there exists $K < \infty$ such that:

$$\lim_{\hat{t} \to \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{\hat{t}} \sum_{t=0}^{\hat{t}} \mathbf{x}(t) \right] < K$$

(15)
Recall that $d_i$ is demand rate on lane $i \in \mathcal{A}_r$ and let $f_i$ be the flow rate on lane $i \in \mathcal{A}$. We impose the following flow conservation constraints:

\[ f_i = d_i \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{A}_r \tag{16} \]
\[ f_j = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}_{ro}} f_i p_{ij} \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{A}_o \tag{17} \]

We can now define the stability region.

**Definition 4.** Let $\mathcal{D}$ be the set of demand rates vectors such that demand rates are inferior to the maximum, unconditional lane service rates, i.e. $\mathcal{D} \equiv \{d_i \leq \bar{s}_i : i \in \mathcal{A}_r\}$. For given turning proportions $p_{ij}$ for each movement $(i, j) \in \mathcal{M}$, we denote $\mathcal{R}$ the stability region consisting of all demand rates vectors $\mathbf{d}$ in the interior of $\mathcal{D}$ verifying the flow conservation constraints (16) and (17), i.e.:

\[ \mathcal{R} \equiv \{\mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{D} : (16) \land (17)\} \tag{18} \]

### 4.2. Mixed-traffic Max-pressure Network Control Policy

The proposed mixed-traffic max-pressure policy selects at each time period $t$ the activation matrix $\alpha(t)$ which maximizes the network-wide pressure among all possible green and blue phases.

**Definition 5.** The network traffic control policy $\pi^*(\mathbf{x}(t))$, defined as:

\[ \pi^*(\mathbf{x}(t)) = \arg \max \left\{ \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} (Z^0_G(\mathbf{x}(t)) \lor Z^0_B(\mathbf{x}(t))) : \alpha(t) \in \mathcal{M} \right\} \tag{19} \]

is hereby referred to as the mixed-traffic max-pressure network control policy for legacy and autonomous vehicles.

At each intersection $n \in \mathcal{N}$, the mixed-traffic max-pressure policy activates the phase maximizing the local pressure which is either $\alpha^0_G(t)$ if the green phase is activated or $\alpha^0_B(t)$ if the blue phase is activated. The implementation of the mixed-traffic max-pressure policy requires the resolution of the two MILPs GREEN and BLUE at each intersection of the network. We next show that this policy is stable for any demand in the stability region $\mathcal{R}$. Since demand is exogenous, any stable policy also maximizes the number of vehicles exiting the network which is equivalent to maximizing network throughput.

**Theorem 1.** The stochastic queue evolution process (1) is stable under the mixed-traffic max-pressure policy $\pi^*$ (19) for any demand rates vector $\mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{R}$.

**Proof.** Let $\|\mathbf{x}(t)\|^2 = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}} (x_i(t))^2$ and let $|\mathbf{x}(t)| = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}} |x_i(t)|$. We first show that $\mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{x}(t + \Delta t)\|^2 - \|\mathbf{x}(t)\|^2 \mid \mathbf{x}(t) \right]$ is upper bounded.

Let $\Delta x_i(t) = x_i(t + \Delta t) - x_i(t)$. We have:

\[ \|\mathbf{x}(t + \Delta t)\|^2 - \|\mathbf{x}(t)\|^2 = \|\mathbf{x}(t) + \Delta \mathbf{x}(t)\|^2 - \|\mathbf{x}(t)\|^2 = 2\mathbf{x}(t)^T \cdot \Delta \mathbf{x}(t) + \|\Delta \mathbf{x}(t)\|^2. \]

We next show that $\mathbf{x}(t)^T \cdot \Delta \mathbf{x}(t)$ and $\|\Delta \mathbf{x}(t)\|^2$ are both upper-bounded.

Let $\mathcal{A}_{ro} = \mathcal{A}_r \cup \mathcal{A}_o$.

\[ \mathbf{x}(t)^T \cdot \Delta \mathbf{x}(t) = -\sum_{j \in \mathcal{A}_{ro}} x_j(t) S_j(\alpha(t)) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{A}_o} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}_{ro}} x_j(t) P_{ij}(t) S_i(\alpha(t)) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{A}_r} x_j(t) D_j(t) \]

\[ = -\sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}_{ro}} x_i(t) S_i(\alpha(t)) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{A}_o} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}_{ro}} x_j(t) P_{ij}(t) S_i(\alpha(t)) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{A}_r} x_j(t) D_j(t) \]

\[ = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}_{ro}} S_i(\alpha(t)) \left( -x_i(t) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{A}_o} x_j(t) P_{ij}(t) \right) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{A}_r} x_j(t) D_j(t) \]
Lemma 1. If the mixed-traffic max-pressure policy $\pi^*$ as defined in (19) is used and the demand vector $\mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{R}$ then $\exists \epsilon > 0$ such that: $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}(t) \cdot \Delta\mathbf{x}(t)|\mathbf{x}(t)] = - \epsilon \mathbf{w}(t)$. 

Proof. Let $y^*_i(t)$ denote the optimal lane service rate if $\pi^*$ is used at time $t$, i.e. if $\mathbf{a}(t) = \pi^*(\mathbf{x}(t))$, then $\mathbb{E}[S_i(\mathbf{a}(t))|\mathbf{x}(t)] = y^*_i(t)$. For each intersection $i$, if the Green phase is selected by the policy then lane services rates are given by the solution of Model (10), i.e. $y^*_i(t) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{A}_o} f_{i,j} y^*_{i,j}(t)$; otherwise, the Blue Phase is selected and we can determine the lane service rates based on the solution of Model (13): $y^*_i(t) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}_i^o} y^*_{i,j}(t)$. Since $\mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{R}$, then $f_i < s_i$ for all $i \in \mathcal{A}_o$ and there exists an array of lane service rates $y^*_i(t)$ and $\epsilon' > 0$ such that:

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}} w_i(t) y^*_i(t) \geq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}} w_i(t) y^*_i(t) \quad \text{with} \quad y^*_i(t) \equiv \begin{cases} f_i + \epsilon' & \text{if } w_i(t) > 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Observe that the existence of $y^*_i(t)$ is trivial if the green phase is activated. In turn, if the blue phase is activated, this array may not be feasible with regards to the feasible region of BLUE. In this case, we can construct a feasible signal phase based on the maximum green phase local pressure solution: since by assumption this local pressure is less than that of the maximum blue phase local pressure, inequality (22) remains valid.

Let $(X)^+ \equiv \max\{X, 0\}$. Inequality (22) implies:

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}(t) \cdot \Delta\mathbf{x}(t)|\mathbf{x}(t)] = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}_o} (f_i - y^*_i(t)) w_i(t) \leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}_o} (f_i - y^*_i(t)) w_i(t)$$

$$= -\epsilon' \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}_o : w_i(t) > 0} w_i(t) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}_o : w_i(t) \leq 0} f_i w_i(t)$$

$$= -\epsilon' \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}_o : w_i(t) > 0} (w_i(t))^+ - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}_o : w_i(t) \leq 0} f_i w_i(t)$$

$$\leq -\epsilon' \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}_o} (w_i(t))^+ \leq -\epsilon' |\mathbf{w}(t)|$$
The function \( x_i(t) \mapsto w_i(t) \) is linear, hence there exists \( \eta > 0 \) such that \( |w(t)| \geq \eta |x(t)| \) or equivalently \( -|w(t)| \leq -\eta |x(t)| = -\eta E[x(t)] \) which implies \( E[x(t)^T \cdot \Delta x(t) | x(t)] \leq -c' \eta |x(t)| = -c E[x(t)] \). \hfill \Box

**Lemma 2.** There exists \( K' \geq 0 \) such that \( E \left[ \| \Delta x(t) \|^2 | x(t) \right] \leq K' \).

**Proof.** Since \( S_i(\alpha(t)) \geq 0 \) and \( P_{ij}(t) \leq 1 \), we have:

\[
\Delta x_j(t) = -S_j(\alpha(t)) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}} P_{ij}(t) S_i(\alpha(t)) + D_j(t) \leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}: (i, j) \in \mathcal{M}_l} S_i(\alpha(t)) + D_j(t) \quad j \in \mathcal{A}_l
\]

\[
\sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}_l} S_i(\alpha(t)) + D_j(t) \quad j \in \mathcal{A}_a
\]

Let \( \tilde{S}_i \) be the maximum value of the random variable \( S_i(\alpha(t)) \). If \( i \in \mathcal{A}_l \), then \( \tilde{S}_i \) can be determined based on the unconditional lane service capacities \( \tilde{s}_i \); otherwise if \( i \in \mathcal{A}_a \), then this bound can be derived from AVs' maximum speed under conflict-free traffic conditions. Let \( \tilde{S} = \max \{ \tilde{S}_i : i \in \mathcal{A} \} \) and let \( K_j \) be the number of lanes permitted to reach lane \( j \), i.e. \( K_j = |i \in \mathcal{A}_l : (i, j) \in \mathcal{M}_l| \) if \( j \in \mathcal{A}_l \) or \( K_j = |i \in \mathcal{A}_a : (i, j) \in \mathcal{M}_a| \) if \( j \in \mathcal{A}_a \). In addition, let \( \tilde{D}_i \) be the maximum value of the random variable \( D_i(t) \). From (27) we get:

\[
\Delta x_j(t) \leq K_j \tilde{S} + \tilde{D}_j
\]

Which gives the following bound:

\[
\| \Delta x(t) \|^2 \leq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{A}} (K_j \tilde{S} + \tilde{D}_j)^2 = K' \quad \Rightarrow E \left[ \| \Delta x(t) \|^2 | x(t) \right] \leq K'
\]

Combining the upper bounds obtained from Lemmas 1 and 2:

\[
E \left[ \| x(t + \Delta t) \|^2 - \| x(t) \|^2 | x(t) \right] = E \left[ 2x(t)^T \cdot \Delta x(t) + \| \Delta x(t) \|^2 | x(t) \right] \leq -2c E[x(t)] + K'
\]

Or equivalently, using unconditional expectations:

\[
E \left[ \| x(t + \Delta t) \|^2 \right] - E \left[ \| x(t) \|^2 \right] \leq -2c E[x(t)] + K' \quad \forall t \in \{0, \Delta t, 2\Delta t, \ldots\}
\]

Summing (30) over \( T \) time periods, i.e. \( t = 0, \ldots, \bar{t} \) with \( \bar{t} = (T - 1)\Delta t \):

\[
E \left[ \| x(\bar{t}) \|^2 \right] - E \left[ \| x(0) \|^2 \right] \leq -2c \sum_{t=0}^{\bar{t}} E[x(t)] + TK'
\]

Which gives:

\[
E \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\bar{t}} x(t) \right] \leq \frac{1}{2c} \left( E \left[ \| x(0) \|^2 \right] - E \left[ \| x(\bar{t}) \|^2 \right] + TK' \right) \leq \frac{1}{2c} \left( E \left[ \| x(0) \|^2 \right] + TK' \right) = K < \infty
\]

Thus verifying the stability condition (15). \hfill \Box

Theorem 1 proves that the proposed mixed-traffic network control policy 19 is stable under the stability region \( \mathcal{R} \) (18). A natural extension of this result is that the pure network traffic control policies wherein only GREEN or BLUE is used to coordinate traffic are also stable.

**Corollary 1.** The pure pressure-based network traffic control policy consisting of Policy (19) with only green (respectively, blue) phases coordinated by GREEN (respectively, BLUE) are stable for any demand rates in the stability region \( \mathcal{R} \).
Proof. To prove that pure network traffic control policies are stable within the stability region $R$ it suffices to observe that policy (19) is defined based on a logical OR-condition taking the maximum local pressure among green and blue phases at each time period and intersection. Hence, Theorem 1 also applies to the unary case wherein only Green or Blue is used to coordinate traffic.

Corollary 1 establishes that pure policies based on Green or Blue traffic control models also maximize throughput. We note that stability of the pure green network traffic control case is an extension of the work of Varaiya [29]. Varaiya [29] proposed a network traffic control policy for a single class of vehicles and assumed that each movement had a dedicated queue. In addition, it was assumed that movement capacities are exogenous to the traffic signal control policy. We have both relaxed this framework by only requiring knowledge of lane-queues and extended the formulation to two classes of lanes. Further, we introduced a pressure-based formulation for green phases (Green) wherein movement capacities calculated endogenously based within the traffic signal control policy.

4.3. Online Network Traffic Control Algorithm

We are now ready to present our decentralized network traffic control algorithm used to implement the proposed mixed-traffic max-pressure network control policy. The pseudo-code of the proposed policy is summarized in Algorithm 1. At each time period $t$, we calculate the optimal Green and Blue phases at each intersection of the network $n \in N$ based on the current state of the network $x(t)$. The phase with the highest local pressure is selected for each intersection.

![Algorithm 1: Mixed-traffic max-pressure network control policy](image)

5. Numerical Experiments

In this section, we conduct numerical experiments to test the proposed mixed-traffic network control policy and report our findings.

5.1. Implementation Framework

We implement the proposed mixed-traffic network control policy on artificial datasets to test computational performance and analyze the algorithm’s behavior. We use a synthesized grid network of size $5 \times 5$, wherein each of the 25 nodes corresponds to a controlled intersection and each edge represents a bidirectional link between adjacent nodes. All intersections have the same topology as that depicted in Figure 1a, i.e. each node has four incoming and four outgoing links, each of which has one LV-lane and one AV-lane. Each incoming lane allows three movements: through, left turn and right turn.

We assume that vehicles’ routes in the network are fixed. In each instance generated, we randomly and uniformly assign an origin and a destination to each vehicle, a route among these nodes and a departure time within the considered time horizon. Origins and destinations are chosen among nodes at the edge of the grid. The level of travel demand is determined by the departure rate of vehicles into the network and the impact of travel demand onto network performance is assessed through a sensitivity analysis.

The time period is set to $\Delta t = 10$ s. We assume that green phases have a lost time of 2 s to account for vehicle start-up delays and signal clearance intervals. We model the impact of lost time on intersection
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Figure 2: Total system travel time for a varying proportion of AVs and vehicle departure rate. The results illustrate the trend of the mean total system travel time over 40 simulations on a 5 × 5 grid network with each link having one AV and one LV lane. The 2xGreen experiment (benchmark) corresponds to the scenario where each link has the capacity of two LV-lanes.

capacity through unconditional movement service rates (\(\bar{s}\)-values) and we conduct a sensitivity analysis on this input parameter. Specifically, let \(C_i\) be the capacity of lane \(i\) and \(L\) be the lost time. Unconditional movement service rates for all LV-movements \((i, j) \in M\) are calculated as \(\bar{s}_{ij} = \min\{C_i, C_j\} \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta t - L}\). In turn, blue phases are assumed to have zero lost time.

We use point-queues for all links in the network and we assume that vehicles take three time steps to travel from an intersection to the next intersection on their route. Vehicles travel through 3 links, each with a 10 s free flow time, between each intersection. Hence, in this configuration, it takes 30 s for a vehicle to travel between two adjacent intersections at free flow. We set the time horizon to 30 minutes and we execute Algorithm 1 periodically until all vehicles have exited the network.

Vehicles’ speed limit through intersections is assumed to be uniform and equal to 44 ft/s and the wave propagation speed is taken as 11 ft/s. We assume that all vehicles have a length of 22 ft and that lanes have a width of 12 ft. We use the triangular fundamental diagram to determine lane capacity which results in 1,440 veh/h.

In all experiments, we explore the sensitivity of the proposed policy with regards to the proportion of AVs by varying the proportion of AVs from 0% to 100% in increments of 10%. To benchmark the performance of the proposed mixed-traffic network control policy (summarized in Algorithm 1), we also simulate network traffic under a traditional traffic signal configuration wherein AV-lanes and blue phases are nonexistent. Under this pure network control policy all AV-lanes are treated as LV-lanes and we model this by using single-lane links with twice the lane capacity of the LV-lanes in the tested network configuration. This benchmark is hereby referred to as 2xGreen. Each experiment is simulated 40 times and average performance is reported.

The simulation framework is implemented in Java on a Windows machine with 8 Gb of RAM and a CPU at 3 GHz. All MILPs are solved with CPLEX 12.8 (Java API) with a time limit of 60 s and default options.

The impact of the departure rate onto network performance is explored in Section 5.2, the impact of lost time during green phases is assessed in Section 5.3 and the activation pattern of green and blue phases is discussed in Section 5.4.

5.2. Impact of departure rate

The evolution of the total system travel time (TSTT) for a varying departure rate is depicted in Figure 2. For this experiment, the green phase lost time is set to 2 s. As expected, we observe that TSTT increases
Figure 3: Average vehicle travel time based on AV proportion and vehicle departure rate. The results depict the mean and standard deviation over 40 simulations on a $5 \times 5$ grid network with each link having one AV and one LV lane. The 2xGreen experiment (benchmark) corresponds to the scenario where each link has the capacity of two LV-lanes.
with the departure rate, i.e. travel demand. We find that the market penetration of AVs has a significant impact on TSTT which is considerably reduced as the proportion of AVs in the network increases. The TSTT increases super-linearly with the departure rate. From 60% of AVs and beyond, we find that the proposed mixed-traffic network control policy outperforms the benchmark, which represents the TSTT when the pure, green network traffic control policy is used with a single LV-lane with twice the capacity of the lanes in the tested configuration.

To further investigate the behavior of the proposed mixed-traffic network control policy, we examine average, vehicle-class travel times relative to the benchmark configuration. Figure 3 shows the average vehicle travel time for AVs (blue series), LVs (green series) and overall (orange series) in the network based on AV proportion and departure rate. The benchmark is shown as a dashed flat line in red. Three main trends can be identified: first, we find that increasing the departure rate mainly impacts the travel time of LVs. Second, the trade-offs between supply (traffic signal activation) and demand (the proportion of AVs) are apparent: a lower proportion of AVs favors LVs’ travel time whereas a higher proportion of AVs penalizes LVs by prioritizing AV-traffic at network intersections. Third, for high levels of travel demand, a sufficiently high proportion of AVs improves on the benchmark, i.e. the average vehicle travel time (over both LVs and AVs) obtained using the mixed-traffic network control policy is lower than the average vehicle travel time obtained with the pure, green network control policy.

For a departure rate of 2,000 veh/h, LVs and AVs’ average travel time remain similar and the mixed-traffic network control policy performs similarly to the benchmark. Increasing the departure rate to 3,000 and 4,000 veh/h, we observe congestion effects impacting LVs’ average travel time, while AVs’ average travel time remain only slightly penalized. Further increasing the departure rate to 5,000 and 6,000 veh/h yields a new pattern: for a proportion of AVs greater or equal to 60%, the aggregate average vehicle travel time improves on the benchmark although LVs’ average travel time remain more penalized than that of AVs. At a departure rate of 8,000 veh/h, we find that both LVs and AVs’ average travel time are lower than the average travel time in the benchmark configuration and considerable travel time reduction are achieved from 60% of AVs and beyond. Specifically, at this departure rate and with a market penetration of AVs of 80%, we find that the average vehicle travel time is reduced by approximately 50% compared to the benchmark.

The computational performance of the proposed mixed-traffic network control policy is illustrated in
Figure 5: Average vehicle travel time based on AV proportion and green phase lost time. The results depict the mean and standard deviation over 40 simulations on a 5 × 5 grid network with each link having one AV and one LV lane. The 2xGreen experiment corresponds to the scenario where each link has the capacity of two LV-lanes.

Figure 4, which depicts the average runtime of MILPs Blue and Green over all intersections and all simulations against the departure rate. The results are reported for a market penetration corresponding to 50% of AVs. Computational runtime increases linearly with departure rate for the Green MILP. The Blue MILP computational performance profile exhibits a super-linear growth with departure. Nevertheless, all MILPs are solved in a few milliseconds. Further, the performance MILPs appears to be robust to vehicles’ route choice and departure time as demonstrated by the low variance of the computational runtime over intersections and simulations. In practice, since the proposed mixed-traffic network control policy is decentralized, the system is easily scalable to arbitrary-size networks.

5.3. Impact of green phase lost time

We next explore the impact of green phase lost time. For this sensitivity analysis we set the departure rate to 5,000 veh/h and compare the baseline configuration (lost time of 2 s) with the cases of null (0 s) and doubled (4 s) lost time. The impact of green phase lost time on TSTT is illustrated in Figure 5. We observe that green phase lost time has a super-linear effect on TSTT. For a high level of AV market penetration, i.e., with 80% of AVs or more, the resulting mixed-traffic configuration is almost insensitive to lost time. We also find that the mixed-traffic network control policy outperforms the benchmark for a sufficiently high market penetration of AVs (in this case, a proportion 60% of AVs).

Figure 5 provides a more detailed outlook on the impact of green phase lost time by examining vehicle-class average travel time. If the green phase lost time is assumed null, we find that LVs’ average travel time remain comparable to AVs’ average travel time, especially if both classes of vehicles are in similar proportions in the network, i.e., for proportions of AVs between 40% to 70%. In turn, doubling the baseline lost time (4 s) considerably penalizes LVs’ average travel time for low proportions of AVs. For an AV market penetration of more than 70%, increasing green phase lost time is better managed with the proposed mixed-traffic network control policy than the in the pure, green network traffic control policy. This can be attributed to the traditional green phase model used in the benchmark configuration: since all lanes are LV-lanes, increasing lost time for green phases results in a considerable loss of capacity compared to the mixed-traffic network configuration.
5.4. Phase activation patterns

To further analyze the behavior of the proposed mixed-traffic network control policy, we report the number of consecutive green or blue phases activated based on the market penetration of AVs in the network. For this analysis, we focus on a departure rate of 5,000 veh/h and a green phase lost time of 2 s, which exhibited the most balanced level of congestion for the generated instances and three AV penetration rates: 20%, 50% and 80%. Figure 7 depicts the distribution of average consecutive phase activation over time periods per intersection and per simulation. For all the proportion of AVs observed, we find that the blue phase is systematically activated for more consecutive time periods compared to the green phase. Since the blue phase admits more combinations of vehicle movements compared to the green phase, the latter often does not have greater pressure until queue lengths are longer. For a proportion of AVs of 20% the distribution of the consecutive activations of green phases shows streaks of up to 10 time periods, with a large majority of streaks of less than 5 time periods. In turn, blue phases can be activated consecutively for up to 45 time periods. Increasing the proportion of AVs to 50% results in more frequent streaks between 10 and 25 time periods for blue phases and more frequent short streaks for green phases. For 80% of AVs in the network, green phases are almost always activated for a single time period only whereas blue phases may remain active for up to 50 time periods.

6. Discussion and Perspectives

In this paper, we proposed a new, pressure-based network traffic control policy for coordinating legacy vehicles (LV) and autonomous vehicles (AV). The proposed approach assumes that LVs and AVs share the urban network infrastructure. Specifically, we hypothesized that dedicated AV-lanes are available for AVs to access traffic intersections, thus obviating the inherent limitations of first-in-first-out (FIFO) lane queues, i.e. vehicle blocking. This design assumption is plausible if the level of penetration of AVs is sufficiently high [14]. It should be noted that AV-lanes need not to be added infrastructure. If the proportion of AVs in the network is high enough, some LV-lanes can be restricted to AV-traffic. We showed that the proposed decentralized mixed-traffic network control policy is stable, i.e. that it maximizes network throughput,
under conventional travel demand conditions and characterized the stability region of the proposed policy. To coordinate traffic at network intersections, we introduced two intersection-level MILP formulations for maximizing local pressure. GREEN is used to coordinate traffic among LV-lanes. The proposed formulation for green phases only requires knowledge of lane queues and conflict-free movement capacities and estimates actual movement capacity endogenously based on phase activation. In addition, since route choice is assumed unknown for LVs, MILP GREEN accounts for vehicle-blocking effects due to FIFO conditions on lane-queues. To manage AV-traffic at network intersections, we introduce a so-called blue phase during which only AVs are allowed to access the intersection. The resulting BLUE MILP is adapted for max-pressure control from the conflict-point formulation introduced by Levin and Rey [15].

We conducted numerical experiments on randomly generated artificial instances on a grid-network to test the proposed policy. We explored the sensitivity of the policy with regards to the proportion of AVs in the network as well as the departure rate, which corresponds to the level of travel demand. We also investigated the impact of green phase lost time and examined consecutive phase activation patterns. We found that the different patterns emerged based on the level of congestion in the network. At low congestion levels, we observe that AVs’ travel time remains close to the benchmark travel time whereas LVs’ travel time is increasingly penalized when the proportion of AVs exceeds that of LVs. A low proportion of AVs penalizes AVs’ travel time; instead a high proportion of AVs penalizes LVs. At higher congestion levels, the mixed-traffic network control policy is seen to outperform the benchmark, thus quantifying the benefits the blue phase model for coordinating AV-traffic. We also find that travel demand mainly impacts LVs’ travel time whereas AVs’ travel time are considerably less penalized. Identifying critical levels of penetration for AVs can provide insight into the management of urban infrastructure. For instance, this can help in assessing at which point it becomes beneficial to restrict specific lanes to AV-traffic.

The outcomes of the experiments also reveal that fairness should be taken into consideration when allocating lanes to vehicle classes (LVs, AVs). Indeed, for high proportions of AVs in the network, LVs’ travel time may be considerably penalized, despite the overall average travel time improving. Exploring the trade-offs between network throughput and fairness will be addressed in future studies. Real-time lane allocation among vehicle classes (e.g. LV, AV) can be expected to further impact route choice and travel behavior altogether. This more general network design and control problem can be modeled using bilevel or simulation-based optimization wherein users’ departure time and route choice can be accounted for based on traffic equilibrium theory [12]. Given that our study is focused on traffic control and assumes fixed route choice, we leave this investigation for future research.
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